United Nations A/65/111

General Assembly

Distr.: General
1 July 2010

Original: English

Sixty-fifth session
Item 105 of the preliminary list*

Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty

Report of the Secretary-General

1. In paragraph 10 of its resolution 64/69 entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization, to prepare a report on the efforts of States that had ratified the Treaty towards its universalization and possibilities for providing assistance on ratification procedures to States that so requested it and to submit such a report to the Assembly at its sixty-fifth session.

2. The present report is submitted pursuant to that request. Information on the subject provided by the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization is contained in the annex.

* A/65/50.

10-43441 (E) 190710

Please recycle

Annex

Report on efforts of States towards the universalization of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty*

June 2009-May 2010

State	*Date/period*	*Activities and context*	*Comments*
1. Bilateral level			
1 (a) Activities relating to annex 2 States			
Australia	March-April 2010	During the Inter-Parliamentary Union meeting, held in Bangkok from 27 March to 1 April, the Australian delegation participated in a meeting of the Twelve Plus Group, which resolved to urge ratification of the Treaty by those annex 2 States that had not yet ratified it. The Australian delegates subsequently held meetings with their Indonesian counterparts to encourage further progress towards that country's ratification of the Treaty	
Austria	June-September 2009	In its capacity as co-Chair of the Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, Austria actively engaged in promoting ratification of the Treaty by those annex 2 States that had not yet ratified it	

* The present report includes activities that have been completed (i.e. that are not ongoing or planned) and that were aimed at promoting the entry into force of the Treaty.

State	Date/period	Activities and context	Comments
Belgium	June 2009-May 2010	Belgium, both bilaterally and as a member of the European Union, was supportive of the Plan of Action of the European Union and, in its bilateral contacts with annex 2 States including, when appropriate, at a high level, systematically raised the importance of ratifying or signing the Treaty and of its entry into force	
Bulgaria	June 2009-May 2010	Bulgaria raised the issue of signature and ratification of the Treaty in bilateral contacts, especially with annex 2 States that had not yet signed or ratified the Treaty and urged them to do so without further delay, stressing the importance of entry into force of the Treaty	
Canada	June 2009-May 2010	In bilateral meetings between Canadian officials and their counterparts in non-ratifying annex 2 States, Canada urged their Governments to ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty	
	August 2009	The Minister of Foreign Affairs wrote letters to his counterparts in non-ratifying annex 2 States to urge their Governments to ratify the Treaty in advance of the September 2009 Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty	

State	Date/period	Activities and context	Comments
	March-May 2010	Canada delivered demarches on behalf of the Group of Eight to eight non-ratifying annex 2 States to urge their Governments to ratify the Treaty in advance of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons	
Estonia	June 2009-May 2010	Estonia raised the issue of Treaty ratification in bilateral meetings, at the ministerial level and below, with annex 2 States that had not yet signed and/or ratified the Treaty with the aim of achieving its entry into force	
France	June 2009-May 2010	France conducted regular discussions with annex 2 States that had not yet signed or ratified the Treaty. In those discussions, France seized every opportunity to stress the importance that it attaches to entry into force of the Treaty	
	May 2010	France welcomed the announcement by Indonesia of its intention to ratify the Treaty and called for the prompt entry into force of the Treaty	
Germany	June 2009-May 2010	During the reporting period, Germany reiterated the importance of the early entry into force of the Treaty and urged its ratification, in particular by remaining annex 2 States, in high-level bilateral talks and relevant multilateral forums	

State	*Date/period*	*Activities and context*	*Comments*
Japan	June 2009-May 2010	Japan took every suitable opportunity in its bilateral contacts to raise the matter of the Treaty with those annex 2 States that had not yet signed or ratified the Treaty	
	March 2010	Japan invited an Indonesian Diet member and Government officials to visit International Monitoring System facilities hosted by Japan and to exchange views on the Treaty with relevant Japanese authorities	
	March 2010	Japan invited an Egyptian delegation, headed by the Director of the Egyptian National Data Centre, to visit IMS facilities hosted by Japan and to exchange views on the Treaty with relevant Japanese authorities	
Mexico	June 2009-May 2010	Mexico supported the efforts made by the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization with the aim of having annex 2 States which had not yet signed and/or ratified the Treaty do so as soon as possible in order to achieve its entry into force	
	June 2009-May 2010	In bilateral meetings with annex 2 States, Mexico reiterated the importance of signing/ratifying the Treaty at the earliest opportunity with the aim of achieving its early entry into force	

State	Date/period	Activities and context	Comments
New Zealand	June 2009-May 2010	New Zealand raised the issue of the importance of the entry into force of the Treaty with several annex 2 States that had not yet ratified it	
Norway	June 2009-May 2010	Norway raised the issue of signature and ratification of the Treaty in bilateral contacts, especially with annex 2 States	
	June 2009-May 2010	Norway rendered financial support to the Verification Research, Training and Information Centre to promote reassessment of issues relating to the Treaty in the United States of America and to advocate for ratification of the Treaty by the latter	
Qatar	June 2009-May 2010	Qatar raised the issue of the importance of accession to the Treaty, its impact on international peace and security and on economic development and human well-being, as well as its entry into force, including with annex 2 States	
Russian Federation	June 2009-May 2010	In its bilateral contacts with countries mentioned in annex 2 to the Treaty, primarily with the United States of America and other countries that had not yet signed or ratified the Treaty, the Russian Federation continued to persistently appeal to them to join the Treaty	

State	Date/period	Activities and context	Comments
Sweden	June 2009-May 2010	Both in the framework of the Swedish European Union Presidency and in its bilateral contacts (at the ministerial level and below), Sweden raised the importance of the entry into force of the Treaty with several annex 2 States that had not yet signed and/or ratified the Treaty	
Turkey	June 2009-May 2010	In its bilateral contacts, Turkey stressed to several annex 2 States the importance of signing and ratifying of the Treaty	
Ukraine	June 2009-May 2010	In the framework of its bilateral contacts with annex 2 States that had not yet signed or ratified the Treaty, Ukraine persistently called upon them to join the Treaty as soon as possible	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	June 2009-May 2010	The United Kingdom took every appropriate opportunity in its bilateral contacts to raise the matter of signature and ratification of the Treaty with those annex 2 States which have not yet signed and/or ratified it, most recently with China, India, Indonesia, Israel and the United States of America	
	4 September 2009	As part of wider bilateral discussions, the United Kingdom raised the issue of ratification of the Treaty with India	

State	*Date/period*	*Activities and context*	*Comments*
	23 November 2009	As part of wider bilateral discussions, the United Kingdom called on Indonesia to ratify the Treaty	
	8 April 2010	As part of wider bilateral discussions, the United Kingdom called on Israel to ratify the Treaty	
1. Bilateral level			
1 (b) Activities relating to non-annex 2 States			
Austria	June-September 2009	In its capacity as co-Chair of the Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, Austria actively engaged in all relevant bilateral and multilateral forums to promote universalization of the Treaty	
Canada	June 2009-May 2010	In bilateral meetings between Canadian officials and their counterparts in non-ratifying non-annex 2 States, Canada urged their Governments to ratify the Treaty	
	August 2009	The Minister of Foreign Affairs wrote letters to his counterparts in non-ratifying non-annex 2 States to urge their Governments to ratify the Treaty in advance of the September 2009 Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty	

State	Date/period	Activities and context	Comments
	March-May 2010	Canada delivered demarches on behalf of the Group of Eight to 33 non-ratifying non-annex 2 States to urge their Governments to ratify the Treaty in advance of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons	
France	June 2009-May 2010	France conducted regular discussions with non-annex 2 States that had not yet signed or ratified the Treaty. In those discussions, France seized every opportunity to stress the importance that it attaches to entry into force of the Treaty	
	January-February 2010	On the occasion of the African Union Summit in Addis Ababa (26 January-2 February 2010), France, in its capacity as co-Chair of the Article XIV process, carried out demarches in the capitals of several African States to encourage ratification of the Treaty	
	May 2010	France welcomed the ratification of the Treaty by the Central African Republic and Trinidad and Tobago and called for the prompt entry into force of the Treaty	

State	Date/period	Activities and context	Comments
	May-June 2010	On the occasion of the Africa-France Summit, France, in its capacity as co-Chair of the Article XIV process, carried out demarches in the capitals of several African States to encourage ratification of the Treaty	
Jordan	June 2009-May 2010	In its cooperation with the leadership of the armed forces of allied and friendly countries and defence attachés accredited to Jordan, the Jordanian Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Military utilized Jordan's policy of openness to encourage those States to sign and ratify the Treaty	
Mexico	June 2009-May 2010	In bilateral meetings, at the ministerial and vice-ministerial levels, Mexico urged those States that have not yet signed or ratified the Treaty to do so at the earliest opportunity with the aim of supporting the efforts made by the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization to increase the already high number of States signatories that wish to see the Treaty enter into force in the near future	
New Zealand	June 2009-May 2010	Whenever relevant during bilateral occasions, New Zealand underlined to non-annex 2 States the importance of the Treaty and promoted its earliest possible entry into force	

State	*Date/period*	*Activities and context*	*Comments*
	June 2009-May 2010	New Zealand provided voluntary financial contributions to enable experts from non-annex 2 developing countries to participate in official technical meetings of the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization, thereby reiterating the universal character of the Treaty	
Qatar	June 2009-May 2010	Qatar raised the issue of the importance of accession to the Treaty, its impact on international peace and security, and on economic development and human well-being, as well as its entry into force with non-annex 2 States	
Russian Federation	June 2009-May 2010	In the framework of its bilateral contacts with those non-annex 2 States that had not yet signed or ratified the Treaty, the Russian Federation persistently continued to call upon them to join the Treaty as soon as possible	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	June 2009-May 2010	On 8 October 2009, Trinidad and Tobago signed the Treaty and ratified it on 26 May, following the provision of funding by the United Kingdom to promote the signing and ratification of the Treaty by Trinidad and Tobago	

State	*Date/period*	*Activities and context*	*Comments*
Ukraine	June 2009-May 2010	In the framework of its bilateral contacts with non-annex 2 States that had not yet signed or ratified the Treaty, Ukraine persistently called upon them to join the Treaty as soon as possible	
2. Multilateral level			
2 (a) Global			
Australia	June 2009-May 2010	Australia continued to work closely with the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization to coordinate approaches to promote universalization of the Treaty. This was a subject of discussion between the Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade and the Executive Secretary of the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization during their meeting in Vienna on 19 February 2010	
	16 September 2009	The Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade addressed the Conference on Facilitating Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, during which he emphasized, inter alia, the importance of ratification by all States of the Treaty	

State	Date/period	Activities and context	Comments
	March-April 2010	At the Inter-Parliamentary Union meeting held from 27 March to 1 April in Bangkok, the Speaker of the Australian House of Representatives delivered an address to the special session of the Inter-Parliamentary Union on nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. He emphasized the importance of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty as a means of reinforcing the collective security benefits of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons	
	April 2010	The Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade wrote an article for the April 2010 edition of *Spectrum*, the magazine of the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization, in which he promoted the collective security and humanitarian benefits of the entry into force of the Treaty and urged all States to ratify it	

State	Date/period	Activities and context	Comments
	May 2010	The Australian Government promoted universalization and entry into force of the Treaty throughout the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, held in May. The Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade delivered the Australian national statement on 3 May and the Pacific Islands Forum statement on 4 May to the Review Conference general debate, both of which included strong calls for the universalization of the Treaty. The Australian delegation to the Review Conference also urged all States to ratify the Treaty in its statement at the meeting of Main Committee I	
Austria	June-September 2009	In its capacity as co-Chair of the Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, Austria actively engaged in all relevant bilateral and multilateral forums to promote universalization of the Treaty. Austria also supported the International Scientific Studies Conference held in Vienna in June 2009, which focused on issues related to the capability and readiness of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty verification regime to detect nuclear explosions worldwide	

State	*Date/period*	*Activities and context*	*Comments*
	September 2009	As a non-permanent member of the Security Council, Austria, represented at the Security Council summit by its President, supported the adoption of resolution 1887 (2009) calling upon, inter alia, all States to sign and ratify the Treaty	
Belgium	June 2009-May 2010	Belgium, both in its national capacity and as a member of the European Union, reiterated its commitment to the Treaty and the importance it attaches to its early entry into force in various appropriate international forums	
	September 2009	The Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs participated in the Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and delivered a statement in favour of the entry into force of the Treaty	
	September 2009	The early entry into force of the Treaty was one of the priorities of Belgium in the framework of the sixty-fourth session of the General Assembly. This was underlined in a public note, published, inter alia, on the website of the Belgian Federal Public Service Foreign Affairs, urging annex 2 States to give positive signs by signing and/or ratifying the Treaty	

State	Date/period	Activities and context	Comments
	December 2009	Belgium voted in favour of General Assembly resolutions 64/57 entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", 64/47 entitled "General and complete disarmament: renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons" and 64/69 entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", all of which call for, inter alia, the prompt entry into force of the Treaty	
Bulgaria	September 2009	Bulgaria participated in the Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, held in New York, to promote the entry into force of the Treaty and endorsed its joint statement	
	June 2009-May 2010	Bulgaria supported the adoption of resolutions by the General Assembly encouraging all States to ratify the Treaty and repeated this entreaty in national statements to the Assembly and to the International Atomic Energy Agency and in statements related to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons	

State	*Date/period*	*Activities and context*	*Comments*
Canada	June 2009-May 2010	Canada actively participated in the discussions in Vienna on the draft Final Declaration for the Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty	
	November 2009	Canada achieved certification of the last of the 16 International Monitoring System Stations and laboratories that are hosted by it	
	December 2009	Canada voted in favour of the following General Assembly resolutions that called for, inter alia, the entry into force of the Treaty: 64/69, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", 64/47, entitled "General and complete disarmament: renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", and 64/57, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments"	

State	*Date/period*	*Activities and context*	*Comments*
Chile	May 2009	During the Third Session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Chile participated in the drafting of the recommendations to the Conference, supporting the inclusion of a paragraph calling on the universalization of the Treaty	
	May 2009	Chile took over the coordination of focal points of the Conference of States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Zones and, in this capacity, promoted the inclusion in the Conference declaration of a paragraph calling for the universalization of the Treaty and its early entry into force	
	October 2009	In its statement in the First Committee of the General Assembly, Chile called for the universalization of the Treaty and its early entry into force	
	December 2009	In the meeting in Tokyo of Group of Eight Sherpas and sub-Sherpas, preparatory to the Nuclear Security Summit in Washington, D.C., Chile referred to the contribution of the Treaty to disarmament and non-proliferation and called for its early entry into force	

State	*Date/period*	*Activities and context*	*Comments*
Czech Republic	June 2009-May 2010	The Czech Republic seized every opportunity to promote the Treaty and its entry into force in relevant international forums	
	24-25 September 2009	The Czech Republic actively participated in the Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, held in New York, and supported the adoption of its final declaration	
	2 December 2009	The Czech Republic co-sponsored General Assembly resolution 64/69 entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty"	
Estonia	September 2009	Estonia participated in the Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, held in New York, to facilitate the entry into force of the Treaty	
	October-November 2009	Estonia co-sponsored General Assembly resolution 64/69 entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty"	
France	June 2009-May 2010	In relevant multilateral forums (e.g. the United Nations, the Conference on Disarmament and the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons), France seized every opportunity to promote the entry into force of the Treaty	

State	Date/period	Activities and context	Comments
	September 2009	France was elected (with Morocco) by the ratifying States as co-Chair of the Article XIV process for facilitating the entry into force of the Treaty	
	September 2009	France co-chaired (with Morocco) the Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, held on 24 and 25 September 2009 in New York, and called for a prompt entry into force of the Treaty	
	February 2010	At the Global Zero Conference held in Paris, France called for a prompt entry into force of the Treaty	
	February 2010	In its capacity as co-Chair of the Article XIV process, France presented (with Morocco) to the States signatories elements of an action plan for facilitating the entry into force of the Treaty	
	March-April 2010	At the 122nd assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, held in Bangkok, in its capacity as co-Chair of the Article XIV process, the French delegation carried out démarches towards several States to encourage ratification of the Treaty	

State	Date/period	Activities and context	Comments
	May 2010	During the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, held in New York, France, as co-Chair of the Article XIV process, co-organized with Morocco and the East-West Institute (United States of America), a side event on the theme "Promoting the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty: politics, science and capacity development"	
Germany	June 2009-May 2010	Upon assumption of office in 2009, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Germany emphasized the need for renewed international efforts in the areas of disarmament and non-proliferation. In this context, he called for the early entry into force of the Treaty in various public appearances, speeches and articles both in the international context and in the German Parliament (Bundestag)	
	June 2009-May 2010	In a joint article, with the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan, published in May 2010, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Germany underscored the importance of the early entry into force of the Treaty and called for speedy ratification by the remaining annex 2 States	

State	Date/period	Activities and context	Comments
	June 2009-May 2010	Germany actively participated in the Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, held in September 2009 in New York. Likewise, it stressed the relevance of the Treaty and its early entry into force at the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, held in May	
	June 2009-May 2010	While publicly welcoming the summit meeting held on 24 September 2009 and the adoption by the Security Council of resolution 1887 (2009) as a significant event for disarmament and non-proliferation, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Germany called for the early entry into force of the Treaty as one of the most important concrete measures mentioned in the resolution	
Hungary	June 2009-May 2010	Hungary seized every opportunity to promote the entry into force of the Treaty. Hungary reiterated in relevant multilateral forums the importance of and Hungary's support for the entry into force of the Treaty, and urged its ratification	

State	Date/period	Activities and context	Comments
	24-25 September 2009	Hungary participated in the Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, made a statement in support of the Treaty and endorsed the document entitled "Final Declaration and Measures to Promote the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty" and the report of the conference	
	2 December 2009	Hungary co-sponsored General Assembly resolution 64/69 entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty"	
Japan	September 2009	The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan participated in the Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, held in New York, and announced Japan's initiative to promote the early entry into force of the Treaty	
	June-March 2010	Japan invited 11 seismology experts from eight countries to take part in the training course in Global Seismological Observation, which deals with global seismological observation and its application to nuclear test monitoring technology	

State	*Date/period*	*Activities and context*	*Comments*
Jordan	June 2009-May 2010	In relevant multilateral forums and workshops, Jordan seized every opportunity to promote the entry into force of the Treaty. In addition, Jordan utilized the visits of high-ranking officers of military delegations to Jordan and the participation of its high-ranking military officers in regional and international workshops and meetings regarding the disarmament and non-proliferation to encourage States to sign and ratify the Treaty and prevent any actions that are incompatible with the purposes of the Treaty	
	June 2009-May 2010	Jordan, through the Royal Jordanian Command and Staff College and the Royal Jordanian National Defense College, hosted many military delegations from other countries to explain its position towards the ratification of the Treaty	
	June 2009-May 2010	The Jordanian Joint Chiefs of Staff of the military issued instructions and orders to Jordanian military attachés accredited to other States to use the opportunity at workshops and all formal and informal meetings to explain the position of the Jordanian Armed Forces regarding disarmament and non-proliferation, and the Treaty	

State	Date/period	Activities and context	Comments
Mexico	24-25 September 2009	Mexico participated in the Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, which was held in New York on 24 and 25 September 2009	
	2 December 2009	Mexico co-sponsored General Assembly resolution 64/94 entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty"	
	June 2009-May 2010	Mexico participated in the meetings of the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization and its subsidiary bodies, as well as in consultations aimed at promoting the entry into force of the Treaty and at strengthening the verification regime	
Mongolia	September 2009	Mongolia participated in the Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, held in New York on 24 and 25 September 2009. Mongolia's representative made a statement reaffirming the country's firm commitment to promoting the entry into force of the Treaty	

State	Date/period	Activities and context	Comments
New Zealand	24 September 2009	The Minister for Foreign Affairs of New Zealand delivered a statement at the Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty in New York encouraging those States whose ratification is required for entry into force to ratify the Treaty without delay	
	2 December 2009	New Zealand co-sponsored General Assembly resolution 64/69 entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty"	
	November 2009-May 2010	As part of the "Vienna Group of Ten" and its activities in advance of and during the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, New Zealand co-authored a paper emphasizing the need for early entry into force of the Treaty and calling on the remaining annex 2 States to sign and/or ratify the Treaty as soon as possible	
Norway	June 2009-May 2010	Norway supported resolutions in the General Assembly encouraging all countries to ratify the Treaty and repeated this plea in national statements in the Assembly, in the International Atomic Energy Agency and in statements related to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons	

State	*Date/period*	*Activities and context*	*Comments*
	June-December 2009	Norway provided a contribution, as a donor country, to finance the participation of experts from developing countries in technical meetings of the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization, within the context of the pilot project	
	25 March 2010	The China Arms Control and Disarmament Association organized a conference on disarmament and non-proliferation in cooperation with Norway, Sweden and the Netherlands. The book *Nuclear Test Ban — Converting Political Vision to Reality* by authors from Norway, Sweden and the Netherlands was a part of the basis for this conference	
Qatar	June 2009-May 2010	Qatar's declarations and position during international conferences and other events reflect an invitation for all countries to quickly accede to the Treaty and to support its entry into force, and its universality	

State	Date/period	Activities and context	Comments
Russian Federation	June 2009-May 2010	Within the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons review process and 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Russian Federation constantly advanced the entry into force of the Treaty as a key issue, emphasizing the strong recommendations of the Conference in this regard. The Russian Federation underscored the importance of the universalization of the Treaty for the stability in different regions of the world, primarily in the Middle East	
	April 2009	Russian parliamentarians supported the adoption of the resolution underlining the role and significance of the Treaty by the 120th assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union	
	July 2009	The Russian Federation was one of the States who initiated the inclusion in the Group of Eight L'Aquila statement on non-proliferation of provisions underscoring the early entry into force and universalization of the Treaty	

State	*Date/period*	*Activities and context*	*Comments*
	24 September 2009	The Russian Federation fully contributed to the adoption at the Security Council summit on non-proliferation and disarmament of resolution 1887 (2009), which contains the provisions in support of the Treaty	
	24-25 September 2009	The Russian Federation actively contributed to the successful conduct of the Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, which was held in New York on 24 and 25 September 2009. At present, the Russian Federation, together with other States, is working on the implementation of an action plan for facilitating the entry into force of the Treaty, which was adopted by the Conference	
	2 December 2009	The Russian Federation supported and co-sponsored resolution 64/69 entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", which was adopted by the General Assembly on 2 December 2009	
Serbia	September 2009	Serbia participated in the Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Treaty, convened pursuant to Article XIV of the Treaty, which was in New York on 24 and 25 September 2009	

State	Date/period	Activities and context	Comments
	May 2010	Serbia supported United Nations activities and those of other multilateral entities aimed at ensuring the early entry into force of the Treaty, one of the pillars of the international regime of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Serbia stressed, in his statement during the general debate at the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, that Serbia warmly welcomed the initiative of the Secretary-General to host a ministerial meeting to bring the Treaty into force as soon as possible	
Sweden	September 2009	At the Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty in September, a Swedish delegation headed by the Swedish Minister for Foreign Affairs represented the European Union. In a meeting with the Executive Secretary at the outset of the Conference, the Swedish Minister for Foreign Affairs emphasized the continued commitment of Sweden and the European Union to a swift ratification of the Treaty	
Switzerland	June 2009-May 2010	Switzerland called for the entry into force of the Treaty in all its statements in relevant forums	

State	*Date/period*	*Activities and context*	*Comments*
	December 2009	Switzerland voted in favour of General Assembly resolutions 64/69 (Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty), 64/54 (towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments) and 64/47 (general and complete disarmament: renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons), all of which call for, inter alia, the entry into force of the Treaty	
Turkey	June 2009-May 2010	Turkey provided a contribution, as a donor country, to finance the participation of experts from developing countries in technical meetings of the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization, within the context of the pilot project	
	September 2009	Turkey participated in the Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, which was held in New York on 24 and 25 September 2009, and it endorsed the final declaration of the Conference	

State	*Date/period*	*Activities and context*	*Comments*
	2 December 2009	Turkey co-sponsored resolution 64/69, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", which was adopted by the General Assembly at its sixty-fourth session	
	December 2009	Turkey voted in favour of resolution 64/47, entitled "General and complete disarmament: renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", which was adopted by the General Assembly at its sixty-fourth session	
Ukraine	June 2009-May 2010	As the chair-elect of Main Committee II of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Ukraine conducted 10 outreach activities to promote further signatures and ratifications of the Treaty in the context of preparations to the Conference. In the relevant forums, Ukraine seized every opportunity to stress the importance of the entry into force of the Treaty. The universalization of the Treaty was part of the discussions at the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons	

State	Date/period	Activities and context	Comments
	September 2009	Ukraine participated in the Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, held in New York on 24 and 25 September 2009, and supported its final declaration and measures to promote the entry into force of the Treaty	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	June 2009-May 2010	United Kingdom funding has enabled technical experts from developing countries to participate in official technical meetings of the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization, helping to promote universalization of the Treaty and capacity-building in developing countries	
	May 2009	The United Kingdom provided funding to Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs to carry out a project to promote the entry into force of the Treaty through consultations and dialogue with all those annex 2 States whose ratification is a precondition for entry into force (China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (the Islamic Republic of), Israel, Pakistan and the United States of America). As part of this project, on 12 October 2009, the United Kingdom also participated in a meeting with Egypt, India, Israel and Pakistan	

State	*Date/period*	*Activities and context*	*Comments*
	July 2009	The United Kingdom published the Government statement entitled "The Road to 2010: Addressing the Nuclear Question in the Twenty-First Century", which included a call for States that had yet to do so to sign and ratify the Treaty	
	24 September 2009	The Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs headed the United Kingdom delegation to the Conference on Facilitating Entry into Force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, held in New York on 24 and 25 September 2009. During the conference, the Minister called on the remaining annex 2 States to sign and ratify the Treaty	
	March 2010	The United Kingdom participated actively in the drafting and adoption of the Group of Eight non-proliferation statements made in July 2009 and March 2010. Both statements included references to promoting the entry into force of the Treaty	

State	*Date/period*	*Activities and context*	*Comments*
	April 2010	The United Kingdom's statement to the United Nations Disarmament Commission in New York urged all States that have not yet done so to sign and ratify the Treaty unconditionally and without delay, in particular the nine remaining annex 2 countries	
2. Multilateral level			
2 (b) Regional			
Australia	June 2009	Following the workshop organized by the Provisional Technical Secretariat to the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization, held in Palau on 21 and 22 May 2009, the Australian Safeguards and Non-Proliferation Office undertook follow-up activities to encourage progress towards universalization of the Treaty, including by sharing with some participants Australia's national experiences with implementation arrangements for the Treaty	
	June 2009-May 2010	In bilateral exchanges, in particular with other countries in the Asia-Pacific region, Australia encouraged ratification of the Treaty by those States which have yet to do so, as well as offered to provide assistance in the process	

State	*Date/period*	*Activities and context*	*Comments*
	May 2010	On 17-21 May 2010, the Australian Safeguards and Non-Proliferation Office, in conjunction with Geoscience Australia and the Provisional Technical Secretariat to the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization, conducted a workshop in Canberra focusing on the establishment of National Data Centres and Treaty universalization. Regional states, including Pacific Island countries, took part in the workshop	
Austria	March 2010	As a Member State of the European Union, Austria co-sponsored the position of the European Union for the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons calling upon all remaining States, inter alia, to sign and ratify the Treaty without delay and without conditions. Similarly, as part of the "Vienna Group of Ten", Austria co-sponsored a working paper for the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons with the same appeal	

State	*Date/period*	*Activities and context*	*Comments*
Belgium	**July 2009-May 2010**	**Belgium, both in its national capacity and as a Member State of the European Union, continued to address the issue of the signature, ratification and early entry into force of the Treaty in the appropriate regional forums**	
France	**January-February 2010**	**At the African Union Summit, held in Addis Ababa from 26 January to 2 February 2010, France, in its capacity as co-Chair of the Article XIV process, carried out démarches towards several African States to encourage ratification of the Treaty**	
	March 2010	In its capacity as co-Chair of the Article XIV process, France participated in the regional workshop organized by Mongolia and the Provisional Technical secretariat to the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization in Ulaanbaatar	
	May-June 2010	At the Africa-France Summit, held in Nice, France, from 31 May to 1 June 2010, France, in its capacity as co-Chair of the Article XIV process, carried out démarches towards several African States to encourage ratification of the Treaty	

State	*Date/period*	*Activities and context*	*Comments*
Germany	June 2009-May 2010	As a Member State of the European Union, Germany actively supported the relevant statements, positions and contributions of the European Union in support of the Treaty	
Hungary	July 2009-May 2010	Hungary, as a Member State of the European Union, supported the joint efforts of the European Union to promote the Treaty and its entry into force, including the implementation of relevant Council Joint Actions in support of the Treaty	
Mexico	28 January 2010	Mexico supported the adoption of the resolution entitled "Inter-American Support for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty" at the Fortieth General Assembly of the Organization of American States during the Session of the Committee on Hemispheric Security, held on 28 January 2010	

State	*Date/period*	*Activities and context*	*Comments*
Mongolia	15-16 May 2010	Mongolia and the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization jointly organized a regional workshop on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and on strengthening capacity-building, in Ulaanbaatar. The two day workshop was attended by over 50 delegates from 19 countries, including both annex 2 and non-annex 2 States that had not yet signed and/or ratified the Treaty. The workshop contributed significantly to increasing awareness and promoting the universalization and entry into force of the Treaty among countries in the region, in particular amid the recent positive developments and momentum for nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. It also helped to increase the participating countries' national capacity on legal and technical matters related to the Treaty	
Qatar	June 2009-May 2010	Qatar's declarations and position during regional conferences and other regional events reflect an invitation for all countries to quickly accede to the Treaty and to support its entry into force, and its universality	

State	*Date/period*	*Activities and context*	*Comments*
Ukraine	December 2009	Ukraine initiated the adoption, on 2 December 2009, of the Organization for Security and Cooperation Ministerial Council Declaration on non-proliferation. In the Declaration, States reaffirmed their full commitment to the early entry into force of the Treaty. Pending its entry into force, all States were called upon to abide by a moratorium on nuclear weapon test explosions and to refrain from any action contrary to the obligations and provisions of the Treaty	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	June 2009-May 2010	The United Kingdom fully supported efforts by the European Union to promote the entry into force and universalization of the Treaty, most recently in the context of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, held in May 2010	

United Nations A/65/112

General Assembly

Distr.: General
6 July 2010

Original: English

Sixty-fifth session
Item 85 of the preliminary list*
Consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives

Consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives

Report of the Secretary-General

Summary

Seventeen States submitted reports, pursuant to paragraph 10 of General Assembly resolution 63/126, by the established deadline (see section II of the present report).

Eight views were received from States pursuant to paragraph 12 of General Assembly resolution 63/126 (see section III).

Four additional States became participants to the instruments relevant to the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives (see section IV), since the previous report (A/63/121) on the topic.

* A/65/50.

10-43699 (E) 210710

Please recycle

I. Introduction

1. On 11 December 2008, the General Assembly adopted resolution 63/126, entitled "Consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives". Paragraphs 10, 12 and 13 of the resolution read as follows:

> *The General Assembly*,
>
> ...
>
> 10. *Requests*:
>
> (a) All States to report to the Secretary-General as promptly as possible serious violations of the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives as well as missions and representatives with diplomatic status to international intergovernmental organizations;
>
> (b) The State in which the violation took place — and, to the extent possible, the State where the alleged offender is present — to report to the Secretary-General as promptly as possible on measures taken to bring the offender to justice and eventually to communicate, in accordance with its laws, the final outcome of the proceedings against the offender, and to report on measures adopted with a view to preventing a repetition of such violations;
>
> (c) The States so reporting to consider using or taking into account the guidelines prepared by the Secretary-General;
>
> ...
>
> 12. *Also requests* the Secretary-General to invite States, in the circular note referred to in paragraph 11 (a) above, to inform him of their views with respect to any measures needed or already taken to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives as well as missions and representatives with diplomatic status to international intergovernmental organizations;
>
> 13. *Further requests* the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its sixty-fifth session a report containing:
>
> (a) Information on the state of ratification of, and accessions to, the instruments referred to in paragraph 8 above;
>
> (b) A summary of the reports received and views expressed pursuant to paragraphs 10 and 12 above;

2. By notes dated 31 December 2008 and 9 April 2010, the Secretary-General drew the attention of States to the request contained in paragraph 10 (a) of resolution 63/126 and invited them to report to the Secretary-General serious violations of the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives.

3. The present report has been prepared pursuant to paragraph 13 of resolution 63/126.

4. Section II of the report contains a summary of the reports received and the text of those reports relevant to paragraph 10 of the resolution.

5. Section III of the report contains the views expressed pursuant to paragraph 12 of the resolution.

6. Section IV of the report contains information on the status of participation of States, as at 10 June 2010, in the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961,[1] the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations of 1963,[2] and the respective optional protocols thereto, as well as the 1973 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents.[3]

II. Reports received from States pursuant to paragraph 10 of General Assembly resolution 63/126

7. **Turkey** (10 October 2008) referred to the communication from Greece of 22 August 2008 in connection with paragraph 16 (b) of the report submitted by Greece on 30 June 2008 (see A/63/121/Add.1) and drew attention to the last sentence of paragraph 25 (1) of its previous report (15 May 2008) (see A/63/121), which reads as follows:

> Furthermore, in spite of the requests of the Turkish Embassy that demonstrators be kept at a distance from the Embassy, Greek police in some cases want to negotiate **with the officials of the Turkish Embassy** so that the demonstrators can approach the entrance of the Embassy building in order to post their declarations on the door. (emphasis added)

8. **Turkey** further reported as follows:

> The Permanent Mission of Turkey would like to underline that it is the subject matter of the negotiation, rather than its addressee that might adversely affect the security and safety of diplomatic missions.
>
> The reporting mechanism established pursuant to the relevant General Assembly resolutions on the agenda item "Consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives" is functional both in terms of bringing the serious violations of the protection, safety and security of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives to the attention of States and informing them about measures taken and results achieved. It was only through the report submitted by Greece that Turkey was apprised of the steps taken by the Greek authorities as regards the simultaneous arson attacks committed against the vehicles of the personnel of the Turkish Embassy and Consulate General in Athens, since the repeated requests of the Turkish authorities seeking information in this regard remain unanswered to date. In connection with paragraph 16 (a) of the report submitted by Greece (see A/63/121/Add.1), the Permanent Mission of Turkey wishes to recall that the local police authorities themselves described these arson attacks as "terrorist acts".
>
> On 16 July 2008, shortly after the submission of the previous report, the car of the attaché of the Turkish Embassy in Athens was damaged by unknown

[1] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 500, No. 7310.
[2] Ibid., vol. 596, No. 8638.
[3] Ibid., vol. 1035, No. 15410.

person(s). In its note verbale dated 16 July 2008, the Turkish Embassy brought the incident immediately to the attention of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Greece and requested it to inform the relevant Greek authorities. The response from the Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs was, however, received on 4 September 2008; it only states that the relevant authorities had been informed about the incident and omits any substantive information as to the follow up of the said incident.

9. The **Islamic Republic of Iran** (17 October 2008) reported incidents involving Iranian diplomats and diplomatic premises in Canberra, Australia (2007-2008), a vehicle belonging to the counsellor of the Embassy of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Athens (2008) and Iranian diplomatic and consular missions and representatives in Iraq (2004-2008):

Australia

In 2007 and early 2008, there were several incidents against Iranian diplomats and diplomatic premises in Canberra, Australia, which violated their safety and security. On 24 July 2007, there was a robbery attack against the residence of the counsellor of the Embassy, as a result of which some valuables and money were stolen. On 22 November 2007, unknown individuals broke into the residence of the counsellor of the Embassy of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Canberra and messed up everything. On 30 December 2007, stones and other hard objects were thrown at the Ambassador's residential building, which caused damage to the premises and broke windows. On 29 January 2008, there was an attempted kidnapping of the child of the counsellor of the Embassy. In response to the Embassy's demand that necessary measures be taken to investigate the attempted kidnapping case and prosecute the perpetrator(s), the Australian relevant officials asked for certain actions on the part of the counsellor's family that amounted to waiving their diplomatic immunity, which Iran (Islamic Republic of) could not accept. The perpetrators in all the above incidents remain unidentified. It is noteworthy that, despite numerous incidents and threats against diplomatic premises (the Embassy and the Ambassador's residential building), no measure has thus far been taken to post permanent guards at the two premises.

Greece

On 8 March 2008, a vehicle belonging to the counsellor of the Embassy of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Athens was attacked at the Polytechnic University campus by unknown perpetrators. According to eyewitness accounts, five masked perpetrators attacked the car (a 2007 BMW) and smashed it completely. The Embassy has requested the relevant Government authorities of the host country to take the necessary measures to investigate the incident and prosecute the perpetrators and to compensate for damages.

Iraq

Since early 2006, there have been many attacks and incidents against Iranian diplomatic and consular missions and representatives in Iraq; the most important are outlined as follows:

The most serious of all was the attack orchestrated and launched by the United States military forces in Iraq. On 11 January 2007, the United States

military forces stormed the Consulate General of the Islamic Republic of Iran in the northern Iraqi city of Erbil and occupied its premises. They abducted five consular officers, confiscated computers and official documents, and damaged the Consulate General premises. The Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations Headquarters in New York informed the Secretary-General of this insolent unlawful act by its letter dated 19 January 2007 (A/61/706-S/2007/28). This was followed up by subsequent letters dated 4 April 2007 and 13 June 2007 (A/61/955-S/2007/355). The abductees were subjected to horrific physical and mental torture. Two of them were released months later. Their account of inhuman behaviour towards them was shocking. Despite repeated calls for their release, the three abductees are still in detention.

This was not the only act of violence against Iranian diplomatic and consular missions and representatives by the foreign forces in Iraq. On 7 April and 8 May 2007, the premises of the Consulate General of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Basra were attacked by British military forces, as a result of which the walls and protection facilities, as well as vehicles belonging to the Consulate General, were extensively damaged. On 13 June 2007, three Iranian diplomats were detained by United States troops in Baghdad. They were interrogated for 18 hours and their money, which amounted to $2,000, was confiscated. Moreover, in August 2007, three Iranian diplomats were detained at the entrance of the Embassy of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Baghdad by United States troops. One of the three diplomats was released 24 hours later and the other diplomats were held in detention for four days. On 29 August 2007, an Iranian diplomat and six members of the delegation of the Iranian Ministry of Electricity who were in Iraq on an official visit were detained by United States troops. They were released after several hours. On 11 January 2008, four staff members of the Consulate General of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Basra, together with four security guards of the Consulate General, were detained by foreign forces. On 13 April 2008, two staff members of the Consulate General of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Basra were detained by Iraqi and United States troops on the Baghdad-Basra road. On 2 July 2008, British and United States troops launched measures interfering with the movement of the staff members of the Consulate General of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Basra and their families, particularly at the Shalamcheh border. Such upsetting measures have continued to this date.

On 10 June 2006, the Consulate General of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Karbala was attacked by a mob calling themselves "Hassani". They threw stones and smashed the windows of the premises. The attackers climbed over the walls and entered the second floor of the building. They caused damage to the building, pulled down the Iranian flag, and threatened to continue their attacks against the Consulate General in the future. Members of the same group attacked the Consulate General of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Basra on 13 June 2006. On 31 October 2006, the premises of the Consulate General of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Basra were targeted by rockets and mortars.

On 3 February 2007, Mr. Jalal Sharafi, the Second Secretary of the Iranian Embassy in Baghdad, was kidnapped by armed gunmen wearing Iraqi commando uniforms. He was held for 58 days in horrific conditions and was subjected to severe physical and mental persecution, including beating, drilling

his legs and mock executions. The diplomat managed to escape from his dungeon on 3 April 2007.

On 21 September 2007, a bombed car was discovered parked at the entrance of the Consulate General of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Basra. On 20 January 2008, a vehicle belonging to the Consulate General of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Basra was attacked during clashes of a group called "Yamani". On 23 February 2008, the building of the Consulate General of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Basra came under attack by rocket-propelled grenades. On 25 February 2008, the Consulate General of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Basra was the target of shooting by unknown persons. On 8 April 2008, the Consul General of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Basra accompanied by a few staff members and their guards were attacked while driving on the Baghdad-Basra road. One staff member died and others were seriously injured, and the two cars were completely destroyed.

On 15 May 2008, four staff members of the Iranian Embassy in Baghdad, including two diplomats, were seriously wounded in an armed attack that targeted their motorcade while heading to al-Kadhimiya for a visit. We have yet to receive information from Iraqi authorities about the identity of the perpetrators and the measures taken to punish them and compensate the victims.

It is noteworthy that the Islamic Republic of Iran has not yet been informed of the results of the investigations to identify and punish the perpetrator(s) of the assassination of Mr. Khalil Naeimi, the First Secretary of the Iranian Embassy in Baghdad, who was shot in the head while in his car near the Embassy on 15 April 2004.

10. **Greece** (14 November 2008) referred to the communication from Turkey (10 October 2008):

Greece would like to express regret that Turkey has seen fit to return to this issue with a second note verbale that is almost identical to the first.

The Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations, repeating what it has already stated in its first note verbale on the subject, would like to reiterate that Greece, as a State member of the European Union, is fully in compliance with its obligations and with the framework within which European Union States members, as well as all democratic countries, must act in such matters.

Regarding the allegations about occasional contacts between the Greek police and demonstrators, it must be noted that the Greek police inform the Embassy of Turkey when demonstrators express the wish to deliver letters of protest to the Embassy and, in return, convey the Embassy's reply to the demonstrators. In no case does the Greek police assume a negotiating role.

It should furthermore be noted that the Greek police try to defuse tension among the demonstrators and prevent any possible disturbances by intermediating between the demonstrators and the Turkish Embassy staff, so that the latter can accept letters of protest.

However, since this intervention appears to cause inconvenience to the Turkish Embassy, the Greek police could allow the demonstrators to post such letters of protest in adjacent areas.

11. **Belgium** (2 December 2008) reported an incident involving the Embassy of Slovenia in Brussels (2007):

> the Belgian authorities confirm that the Embassy of Slovenia in Brussels was burglarized during the night of 22 to 23 December 2007.
>
> The security service within the Federal Public Service Foreign Affairs (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) has provided the following information:
>
> > The burglary was reported on 24 December by the Second Secretary, Mr. Rok Zargorski, to the following services: the police, the Foreign Affairs Crisis Centre and Government Crisis Centre.
> >
> > A note verbale from the Embassy was received by the security service on 2 January 2008 and the Directorate-General of Legal Affairs contacted its collaborators in the Interior Crisis Centre directly.
> >
> > Police patrols were strengthened and the Embassy was placed under heightened police surveillance.
> >
> > The police prepared reports on, inter alia, their findings at the scene and the search for fingerprints.
>
> Under the provisions of the Code of Criminal Investigation (Code of Criminal Procedure), the Office of the Prosecutor cannot provide any information on this case because the investigation has not been completed.

12. **Australia** (10 December 2008) referred to incidents involving Iranian diplomats and diplomatic premises in Canberra (2007-2008):

> The Australian Government takes seriously its obligations under the Vienna Conventions on Diplomatic and Consular Relations for the protection of all diplomatic and consular missions and their staff. The Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations has drawn attention to four separate incidents involving different staff members of the Embassy of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Canberra or their families over the period from July 2007 to January 2008.
>
> Three of these unfortunate incidents involved housebreaking or vandalism, which investigating local authorities were satisfied were random opportunistic occurrences. There was insufficient evidence available at the scene of each incident to enable police to identify any possible offenders.
>
> The fourth case was determined by investigating police to be an incident involving an elderly man of possibly unsound mind with no obvious intent to kidnap the child. It was not an "attempted kidnapping".
>
> In each case, police officers attended promptly when called by Embassy officials and undertook appropriate investigations.

13. **Turkey** (13 January 2009) referred to its notes dated 15 May 2008 and 10 October 2008, as well as to the reports of 22 August 2008 and 2 December 2008 submitted by Greece to the Secretary-General and informed the Secretary-General

"that the Turkish side will pursue the subject matter of the said correspondences with Greek authorities bilaterally with a view to resolving the issue promptly".

14. **Turkey** (30 January 2009) referred to the terrorist attack against the Consulate General of the United States in Istanbul (2008):

> Following the terrorist attack against the United States Consulate General in Istanbul on 9 July 2008, which killed three and injured two Turkish police officers, the Istanbul Chief Public Prosecutor's Office initiated a criminal investigation. Twelve individuals have been identified to be associated with the perpetrators of [a] terrorist attack, who were killed at the crime scene. Eleven of the said individuals have been released by [the] court whereas one of them remains in prison. Investigations pertaining to the attack are ongoing.
>
> After the terrorist attack, security measures provided to [the] United States Consulate in Istanbul were increased.

15. **Germany** (3 February 2009) referred to incidents involving the German Embassy in Belgrade (2008):

> Attacks by violent demonstrators on 21 February 2008 severely damaged the German Embassy in Belgrade, putting the lives of diplomatic staff of the Embassy in danger and injuring one person.
>
> One of the Embassy's security officers was injured on the hand by a stone which had been thrown. Attempts were made to tear out the iron grille in front of the Embassy entrance. Embassy windows were broken, iron bars were bent, the fence was demolished and the police hut outside the building was burned down. Demonstrators were able to access the Embassy grounds unimpeded.
>
> The Serbian police units detailed to protect the German Embassy that day had suddenly been withdrawn, with the result that the chancery building was unprotected against the violent demonstrators for almost one hour. As was the case at other diplomatic missions in Belgrade, the attacks by the demonstrators took place immediately after the withdrawal of police protection.
>
> Germany regards the obligation contained in the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 18 April 1961 to protect fully and at all times the inviolability of the premises of the mission (article 22) as well as the inviolability of the diplomats working there (article 29) and their families (article 37) as having been violated.

16. **Serbia** (12 February 2009) referred to the attack on the Embassy of the United States in Belgrade:

> The Office of the District Public Prosecutor in Belgrade filed a request to the district court in Belgrade to institute an investigation of Milan Živanović for the commission of the criminal act of grave offence against general security under article 288, paragraph 2, in conjunction with article 278, of the Criminal Code, and the criminal act of grand larceny under article 104, in conjunction with article 103, of the Criminal Code, related to the attack on the Embassy of the United States, located at Ulica Kneza Miloša 46, Belgrade.

In compliance with the conclusions of the Government of Serbia 05 No. 217-3629/2008 of 11 September 2008, the Embassy of the United States has been paid compensation in the amount of 35,421,229.71 dinars for the damage sustained in February 2008.

17. **Mexico** (6 April 2009) referred to incidents involving the Consulate of the United States in the city of Monterrey, Nuevo León (2008):

On 11 October 2008, two individuals are alleged to have fired on and thrown a fragmentation grenade at the building housing the Consulate of the United States in the city of Monterrey, Nuevo León. Officials of the Office of the Attorney General of Mexico reported that, in addition to the damage done to the building by the impact of the bullet, six .45 millimetre calibre cartridges were found at the scene, along with the above-mentioned grenade that failed to detonate.

The officials of the Office of the Attorney General in Monterrey launched a preliminary investigation to identify the persons responsible for the crimes of violation of the Federal Act on Firearms and Explosives and damage to property.

With regard to the ongoing preliminary investigation, the competent authorities have been conducting their investigations, including inspections, expert evidence and collection of witness testimony, with a view to establishing the identity of the alleged perpetrators. To date, however, no arrests have been made.

18. **Greece** (10 July 2009) referred to violations of the protection, security and safety of the Greek Diplomatic and Consular Mission and representatives to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (2008) and noted that all the incidents referred to had been brought, in a timely manner, to the attention of the competent authorities of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia:

On 14 January 2008, the front licence plate of a vehicle belonging to a member of the diplomatic staff of the Greek Liaison Office (licence plate No. 27-CD-049) was stolen. The incident took place in the early morning hours, in front of the staff member's residence in Skopje.

On 19 February 2008, at about 1830 hours, a group of 1,000 demonstrators gathered outside the Greek Liaison Office in Skopje and, while hurling anti-Greek slogans and insults and waving various flags, began attacking the Office premises and throwing numerous stones and bottles. As a result of the attack, which lasted about one and a half hours, stones and broken glass were scattered in the area outside the Office, as well as the yard inside, while one gas container was later found, fortunately unexploded, inside the yard. In addition, the Office's yard lighting, lower floor windows and a piece of the facade marble were damaged. Three vehicles parked outside the Office premises were also damaged. The first was an official vehicle (licence plate No. 027-CD-024), which suffered a broken side window and other external damage. The others were two private vehicles bearing Greek licence plates, and belonging to Liaison Office staff members; No. AXZ 2344 suffered a broken rear window and No. NEP 2635 suffered a broken windscreen and other external damage. It should be noted that, earlier the same day and well before these events occurred, the head of the Greek Liaison Office had warned

the head of the Protocol Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs that this demonstration, which was to take place at the centre of Skopje and had been announced in the press, could eventually endanger the safety of the Liaison Office. As events have shown, the demonstration did quickly turn against the Liaison Office. Furthermore, it should be noted that the head of the Liaison Office had also requested the authorities to immediately increase the police presence. Evidently, the police response was inadequate, chiefly because only a small number of officers were present at the initial stages of the incident; they could not, therefore, restrain the aggressive crowd. Police reinforcements arrived late and only after repeated requests by the head of the Liaison Office to the Protocol Department of the Foreign Ministry.

On 29 February 2008, in the early morning hours, a vehicle belonging to the spouse of a member of the diplomatic staff of the Liaison Office (licence plate No. 27-CD-014) was found vandalized. The tires and doors on the driver's side were, respectively, deflated and damaged with the use of a sharp instrument.

On 24 March 2008, in the early morning hours, the rear licence plate of a vehicle belonging to the spouse of a member of the diplomatic staff of the Liaison Office (licence plate No. 27-CD-001) was stolen. The vehicle was parked in front of the staff member's residence in Skopje.

On 3 April 2008, in the late evening hours, a vehicle belonging to a member of the diplomatic staff of the Liaison Office (licence plate No. 27-CD-049) was vandalized. The vehicle was parked in the parking space of the residence of the staff member in Skopje (same vehicle as in the incident of 14 January 2008).

On 21 April 2008, in the early afternoon hours, an attack occurred against the residence of the head of the Liaison Office by unidentified individual(s). A window on the second floor was destroyed with a heavy piece of wood (dimensions 30 cm by 10 cm) as a result of the attack.

On 26 April 2008, the residence of the First Counsellor for Economic and Commercial Affairs of the Liaison Office was broken into and a number of personal belongings were removed, while its occupant was on a short vacation. The fact that the residence was also vandalized and that the stolen items were small in number and of low commercial value leads to the assumption that the intent of the perpetrator(s) was to intimidate and to threaten while, at the same time, gravely disturbing the domestic peace of the occupant and his family.

On 15 May 2008, in the early morning hours, a vehicle belonging to a member of the administrative staff of the Liaison Office (licence plate NZP-3600) was brutally vandalized by unidentified individual(s). Ethnically motivated slogans had been scratched on the entire left side of the vehicle with a sharp instrument. It should be pointed out that the perpetrator(s) managed to commit their act and flee the crime scene, despite the fact that the vehicle in question was parked in the parking area reserved for the Liaison Office, located right across the security guard's booth.

On 30 May 2008, in the early morning hours, a vehicle belonging to a member of the diplomatic staff of the Liaison Office (licence plate No. 27-CD-049) was vandalized for the second time (see above, incident of

3 April 2008). The incident took place in front of the residence of the staff member in Skopje.

On 18 June 2008, in the early morning hours, unidentified individual(s) entered the courtyard of the residence of the First Counsellor for Economic and Commercial Affairs of the Liaison Office. They uprooted all the plants and threw mud and dirt on his vehicle (same residence as in the incident of 26 April 2008).

On 20 June 2008, a vehicle belonging to a member of the diplomatic staff of the Liaison Office (licence plate No. 27-CD-010) was brutally vandalized by unidentified individual(s). Ethnically motivated slogans were scratched on the vehicle with a sharp instrument. It should be pointed out that the perpetrator(s) managed to commit their act and flee the crime scene, despite the fact that the vehicle in question was parked in the parking area reserved for the Liaison Office, located right across the security guard's booth.

On 27 June 2008, a crowd of approximately 100 individuals gathered in front of the Consular premises of the Liaison Office participated in an organized operation of intimidation against citizens of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia who were waiting their turn in line outside the Greek Consular Office to conduct regular business. The crowd used whistles, hurled insults and made aggressive gestures against them.

On 7 July 2008, two vehicles with licence plates Nos. 27-CD-008 and 27-CD-050 belonging to members of the diplomatic staff of the Liaison Office were brutally vandalized by unidentified individual(s). Ethnically motivated slogans were scratched on the vehicles with a sharp instrument. It should be noted that the perpetrator(s) managed to commit their act and flee the crime scene, despite the fact that the vehicle in question was parked in the parking area reserved for the Liaison Office, located right across the security guard's booth.

19. The **Plurinational State of Bolivia** (11 July 2009), while reporting that there had been no violations on its territory during the reporting period, mentioned that two demonstrations had been held in the course of 2009, outside the Japanese and Peruvian Embassies, and that the coordinated presence of an increased number of police officers had immediately restored calm to the area.

20. **Serbia** (16 July 2009) referred to the incidents involving the Embassy of Slovenia and the Embassy of Germany in Belgrade (2008):

In compliance with its conclusions 05 No. 217-3629/2008 of 11 September 2008, the Government of Serbia has paid the Embassy of Slovenia compensation in the amount of 1,779,924.98 dinars and the Embassy of Germany compensation in the amount of 639,198.99 dinars for the damage sustained in the incidents that took place in the demonstration in Belgrade in 2008.

The Permanent Mission wishes to further advise that no complaints have been filed against any offender and that, accordingly, no investigation or proceedings have been instituted against any party.

21. **Austria** (14 September 2009) referred to incidents involving the Embassy and Consulate of Slovenia in Vienna (2008):

Concerning the reported incident at the Embassy of Slovenia, the Austrian police has taken up investigations and the Vienna Office of the Public Prosecutor has initiated proceedings against anonymous offenders for burglary ("Einbruchsdiebstahl", according to section 129 of the Austrian Penal Code), under reference number 10 UT 789/08f.

The facts of the case have been established as follows: On 14 June 2008, unknown offenders broke into a building at Nibelungengasse 3, 1010 Vienna, which accommodates private business offices, the Embassy and Consulate of Slovenia and the Embassy of Montenegro. Both private and diplomatic offices were broken into. The offenders also attempted to crack the safe of the Consulate and attacked an employee of the Slovenian Embassy.

Video surveillance showed two offenders. However, despite using state-of-the-art technology to analyse the offenders' traces at the site of the crime, the investigators have not been able to identify them. Since it has not been possible to identify suspects who might have committed the burglary, the proceedings have been discontinued according to section 197 of the Austrian Code of Criminal Procedure. This provision obliges the Public Prosecutor to discontinue proceedings if the alleged offenders remain unknown; proceedings must be resumed if the suspected persons are identified.

22. **Austria** (29 March 2010) reported an incident involving the private apartment of an attaché of the Austrian Embassy to the Islamic Republic of Iran (2009):

On 27 January 2009, around 0045 a.m., seven persons dressed in plain clothes and armed with handguns and tasers entered the private apartment of an attaché of the Austrian Embassy by force. They identified themselves as members of the Iranian police force and continued their actions despite having been informed that the attaché was an Austrian diplomat accredited to the Islamic Republic of Iran since 14 November 2005 and that his apartment had been officially notified to the Iranian competent authorities as the private residence of a diplomat. They questioned his guests, searched the apartment and attempted to take photographs of the guests. After the incident, it was discovered that 5 million rials were missing.

The incident was brought to the attention of the Foreign Ministry of the Islamic Republic of Iran by a note verbale dated 4 February 2009. The Islamic Republic of Iran informed the Austrian Embassy in Tehran and the Austrian Federal Ministry of European and International Affairs that the police was investigating the incident and requested further information to pursue the investigations. The Austrian Embassy in Tehran readily agreed to the request for cooperation in this regard.

23. **Sweden** (11 May 2010) referred to incidents involving the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives of Argentina, Denmark, Georgia, Greece, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, Japan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Pakistan, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia and the United States, as well as to a number of minor violations of the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives in Sweden (2008-2009):

Argentina

On 18 January 2008, an unidentified person said on the telephone to an employee of the Embassy that they would be filled with gas and then blown up. The person then made subsequent calls in which they targeted more threats and insults at Embassy staff.

Denmark

On 14 to 17 August 2009, an unidentified person threw white paint and eggs at the Consulate's entrance and wall. "Stop the deportations" was written on the wall.

Georgia

On two separate occasions, an unidentified perpetrator stole the Embassy's national flag. This occurred on the night of 27 September 2009 and the night of 31 October to 1 November 2008.

Greece

A break-in occurred at the residence on 26 September 2009 and objects worth approximately 1.5 million SKr were stolen. The investigation has been abandoned, owing to a lack of new leads.

Islamic Republic of Iran

On 26 June 2009, a demonstration against the Embassy took place, during which a scuffle broke out; some 20 participants shouted offensive slogans, pushed down the Embassy fence and proceeded to punch five Embassy officials and throw stones at the Embassy roof and windows and at Embassy cars. The investigation into violent riot has been abandoned, owing to a lack of conclusive evidence. However, an investigation into vandalism is under way.

In addition, the Embassy received telephone threats on a number of occasions during the autumn of 2009, including a threat to blow up the Embassy building with bombs and ammunition.

Israel

On 4 February 2009, the Ambassador of Israel gave a presentation at a university and had a shoe and books thrown at him by two people. One person is suspected of harassment in this matter.

Japan

On 16 November 2009, the Embassy received a letter stating that a bomb would be placed at the Embassy and detonated via a timer. The investigation was abandoned, owing to a lack of evidence.

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya

On 20 October 2008, a private individual (a Libyan citizen and asylum-seeker) subjected the Embassy to gross vandalism by breaking down the gate with an iron bar and then tearing down plants and a poster of Gaddafi and smashing a window in the reception. He was sentenced to three years' imprisonment for unlawful intrusion and gross vandalism. However, the judgment has been appealed.

Pakistan

On 24 February 2009, a copper bullet was fired at the apartment of a member of the administrative and technical staff, smashing a window. On 5 April 2009, unidentified persons threw stones at the home of another of the Embassy's administrative and technical staff, which resulted in a window being smashed and several stones landing in the bedroom.

Philippines

On 7 August 2008, an e-mail was sent by an individual to the Embassy, stating that he was going to kill at least five unspecified individuals. He referred to an incident in 2005 when his wife was accidentally killed by a rallying mob of five students, who were being chased by a police officer.

Saudi Arabia

On 6 May 2009, a man set fire to his car with lighter fluid and then tried to set fire to the main door of the Embassy. He was arrested following the intervention of the Embassy's security guards and has been given a two-month prison sentence with an electronic ankle bracelet and a probationary term until September 2010 for attempted vandalism.

United States of America

On 12 June 2008, an Embassy official received a text message containing the words "Tomorrow at the latest. Otherwise we'll send a suicide bomber." A person who had threatened that there were bombs inside and outside the Embassy building was ruled out, as he had been sentenced for another crime.

A number of minor violations of the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives in Sweden were also reported during this period. These incidents included trespass on embassy premises, low-level threats, petty thefts and burglaries, and some cases of harassment of visitors to missions. There were also a couple of cases involving various kinds of graffiti on embassy premises and some minor damage to embassy property.

24. **Belgium** (11 May 2010) reported that no security incidents took place at Belgian diplomatic offices abroad in 2009 and submitted a table summarizing the burglaries/thefts that occurred at diplomatic missions of inter alia, Albania, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, India, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Oman, Qatar, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand, Ukraine and Yemen in Belgium in 2009:

List of burglaries/thefts reported to Protocol for 2009

Country	*Type of Mission*	*Type of Crime*	*Date of crime*
Albania	NATO	Theft from vehicle (official)	21/04/2009
Albania	NATO	Attempted burglary (residence of staff member)	19/01/2009
Albania	NATO	Theft from vehicle (official)	03/06/2009
Albania	Embassy	Theft of ambassador's vehicle (official)	22/06/2009
Azerbaijan	Embassy	Burglary (embassy)	24/07/2009
Bulgaria	European Union	Burglary (official residence)	04/07/2009
Bulgaria	Embassy	Attempted theft from vehicle (official)	14/03/2009
Bulgaria	Embassy	Attempted theft from vehicle (official)	04/03/2009
China	European Union	Burglary (diplomatic residence)	No report
China	European Union	Theft of diplomatic bag	No report
China	European Union	Theft of diplomatic bag	No report
Côte d'Ivoire	Embassy	Burglary (embassy)	16/02/2009
Denmark	European Union	Assault of a diplomat and theft of personal effects	26/01/2009
Greece	European Union	Burglary (diplomatic residence)	03/08/2009
Greece	European Union	Burglary (official residence)	01/01/2009
Guinea-Bissau	Embassy	Burglary (embassy)	16/02/2009
Haiti	Embassy	Theft of vehicle (official)	02/10/2009
India	Embassy	Attempted burglary in diplomatic residence	16/03/2009
Jordan	Embassy	Theft from vehicle (official)	12/11/2009
Kyrgyzstan	Embassy	Theft of diplomatic bag	28/09/2009
Oman	Embassy	Burglary (diplomatic residence)	14/05/2009
Qatar	Embassy	Theft of the bag of the ambassador's wife	17/09/2009
Russian Federation	NATO	Burglary (diplomatic residence)	26/04/2009
Russian Federation	European Union	Burglary (diplomatic residence)	27/12/2009
Saudi Arabia	Embassy	Burglary (diplomatic residence)	27/12/2009
Slovakia	Embassy	Assault of a diplomat and theft of bag	05/10/2009

List of burglaries/thefts reported to Protocol for 2009

Country	*Type of Mission*	*Type of Crime*	*Date of crime*
Sri Lanka	Embassy	Theft of diplomatic bag	22/05/2009
Switzerland	Embassy	Burglary (embassy)	07/12/2009
Switzerland	Embassy	Burglary (embassy)	15/08/2009
Thailand	Embassy	Burglary (ambassador's residence)	24/12/2009
Ukraine	European Union	Attempted theft from vehicle (official)	17/02/2009
Ukraine	European Union	Attempted theft from vehicle (official)	02/03/2009
Yemen	Embassy	Burglary (embassy)	24/02/2009

25. The **Czech Republic** (12 May 2010) referred to incidents involving diplomatic missions and diplomatic staff in Iraq as well as to incidents involving the Embassy of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the Swedish Embassy and the Greek Embassy, and a member of the diplomatic staff of the Austrian Embassy in the Czech Republic (since 2009):

> Regarding the violations of the protection, security and safety of the Czech diplomatic and consular missions and representatives, the Embassy of the Czech Republic in Iraq reported on the recent successful attacks on certain diplomatic missions in Iraq and the non-standard treatment frequently experienced by diplomatic staff in Iraq, including the Czech diplomats, in particular at checkpoints and in connection with access to the Baghdad International Airport. The Czech Republic nevertheless welcomes the efforts of the Iraqi Government to facilitate the work and movement of diplomats in the country and calls for further strengthening of cooperation in the area of the security and safety of diplomatic missions and diplomatic staff.
>
> The violations recorded in the Czech Republic since 2009 include breaking and entering into the premises of the Macedonian Embassy and the Swedish Embassy, breaking and entering into an apartment of a member of the diplomatic staff of the Austrian Embassy, and a fire in the garden of the Greek Embassy which, according to available information, was set intentionally. The above-stated crimes are currently being investigated by the Czech police. The embassies concerned, in cooperation with the police, have responded by reinforcing and upgrading their security measures.

26. The **Holy See** (15 May 2010) reported incidents involving **Apostolic Nunciatures** in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (2009) and Angola (2010):

> 1. **Apostolic Nunciature in Angola — armed burglary**: On 19 April 2010, three men armed with a machine gun and a pistol entered the territory of the Apostolic Nunciature under the pretext of handing over an important document. The chargé d'affaires a.i. was threatened and instructed to surrender and hand over cash and valuables inside the house. A formal complaint was filed to the local diplomatic police; details of the inquiry are not yet available.

2. **Apostolic Nunciature in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela — tear-gas bombs inside the compound**: On 19 January 2009, at 5.32 a.m., some people identified as belonging to a group called "*La Piedrita 23 de Enero*" launched five tear-gas bombs from the road. The toxic smoke entered inside the building and caused some light respiratory symptoms in the personnel. The explosive devices were made in a factory that supplies items to the security forces. The perpetrators of this act of vandalism left a leaflet containing a message. The Nunciature formally informed the Ministry of External Affairs through a note verbale, decrying this act of violence and asking for adequate measures to protect the persons and premises of the diplomatic mission.

27. **Burkina Faso** (27 October 2008 and 31 July 2009), the **Plurinational State of Bolivia** (11 July 2009), the **Philippines** (22 April 2010), **Portugal** (26 April 2010) and **Qatar** (7 May 2010) reported that there had been no violations on their respective territories during the reporting period.

III. Views expressed by States pursuant to paragraph 12 of General Assembly resolution 63/126

28. **Australia** (10 December 2008) expressed the following views:

> When an incident occurs involving diplomatic staff or accredited dependents, it is normal procedure for police to require a formal witness statement. This necessitates a request for a specific waiver of immunity under article 32 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations; this statement is taken to facilitate the gathering of evidence and the possible apprehension and prosecution of an offender. The cooperation of diplomatic missions is often indispensable to a successful judicial process.
>
> The Australian Government takes the view that, unless there is an identified specific threat, permanent or static guards at diplomatic premises are neither necessary nor an appropriate means of providing protective security for diplomatic premises in Australia.

29. **Portugal** (26 April 2010) expressed the following view:

> Concerning paragraph 12, the Portuguese Public Security Police considers that the measures being adopted nationally have proved effective. Thus, there is currently no need to make any changes to those measures.

30. **Burkina Faso** (27 October 2008 and 31 July 2009), the **Plurinational State of Bolivia** (11 July 2009), **Jordan** (16 July 2009), **Yemen** (18 August 2009), the **Philippines** (22 April 2010) and **Qatar** (7 May 2010) reported on the measures taken to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives as well as missions and representatives with diplomatic status to international intergovernmental organizations on their respective territories.[4]

[4] For the relevant parts of the reports see the website of the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly (www.un.org/ga/sixth): sixty-fifth session; "Consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives"; full texts of the replies.

IV. Status of participation in international conventions pertaining to the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives as at 10 June 2010

31. Each instrument listed below is represented in tables 1 and 2 by the letter shown on the left in the list.

A. Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961 (signed at Vienna on 18 April 1961; entered into force on 24 April 1964, in accordance with article 51);

B. Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations concerning Acquisition of Nationality of 1961 (signed at Vienna on 18 April 1961; entered into force on 24 April 1964, in accordance with article VI);

C. Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes of 1961 (signed at Vienna on 18 April 1961; entered into force on 24 April 1964);

D. Vienna Convention on Consular Relations of 1963 (signed at Vienna on 24 April 1963; entered into force on 19 March 1967, in accordance with article 77);

E. Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations concerning Acquisition of Nationality of 1963 (signed at Vienna on 24 April 1963; entered into force on 19 March 1967);

F. Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes of 1963 (signed at Vienna on 24 April 1963; entered into force on 19 March 1967);

G. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, of 1973 (adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 14 December 1973; entered into force on 20 February 1977).

Table 1

Total participation in international conventions pertaining to the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives

Signature, succession to signature						
A	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*	*F*	*G*
60	18	29	48	19	38	25
Ratification, accession or succession						
A	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*	*F*	*G*
186	51	66	172	39	48	172

Table 2
Status of participation in international conventions pertaining to the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives

	Signature, succession to signature							*Ratification, accession or succession*						
State	*A*	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*	*F*	*G*	*A*	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*	*F*	*G*
Afghanistan								A						G
Albania	A							A			D			G
Algeria								A			D			G
Andorra								A			D			G
Angola								A			D			
Antigua and Barbuda											D			G
Argentina	A	B		D		F		A	B		D			G
Armenia								A			D			G
Australia	A			D			G	A		C	D		F	G
Austria	A		C	D		F		A		C	D		F	G
Azerbaijan								A			D			G
Bahamas								A		C	D			G
Bahrain								A			D			G
Bangladesh								A			D			G
Barbados								A			D			G
Belarus	A						G	A			D			G
Belgium	A		C	D		F		A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Belize								A			D			G
Benin				D		F		A			D			G
Bhutan								A			D			G
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)				D				A			D			G
Bosnia and Herzegovina					E	F		A	B	C	D			G
Botswana								A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Brazil	A			D	E			A			D			G
Bulgaria	A						G	A		C	D	E	F	G
Burkina Faso				D		F		A			D		F	G
Burundi								A						G
Cambodia								A	B	C	D			G
Cameroon				D	E	F		A			D			G
Canada	A						G	A			D			G
Cape Verde								A			D			G
Central African Republic	A	B	C	D		F		A	B	C				G
Chad								A						
Chile	A			D		F		A			D			G
China								A			D			G

State	Signature, succession to signature							Ratification, accession or succession						
	A	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*	*F*	*G*	*A*	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*	*F*	*G*
Colombia	A		C	D	E	F		A			D			G
Comoros								A						G
Congo				D	E	F		A						
Cook Islands														
Costa Rica	A			D				A		C	D			G
Côte d'Ivoire				D		F		A						G
Croatia								A			D			G
Cuba	A			D				A			D			G
Cyprus								A			D			G
Czech Republic								A			D			G
Democratic People's Republic of Korea								A			D			G
Democratic Republic of the Congo	A			D	E	F		A	B	C	D			G
Denmark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Djibouti								A			D			G
Dominica								A		C	D			G
Dominican Republic	A	B	C	D	E	F		A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Ecuador	A		C	D			G	A		C	D			G
Egypt								A	B		D	E		G
El Salvador								A			D			G
Equatorial Guinea								A			D			G
Eritrea								A			D			
Estonia								A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Ethiopia								A						G
Fiji								A		C	D			G
Finland	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
France	A		C	D		F		A		C	D		F	G
Gabon				D		F		A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Gambia														
Georgia								A			D			G
Germany	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Ghana	A	B	C	D	E	F		A			D	E		G
Greece	A							A			D			G
Grenada								A			D			G
Guatemala	A						G	A			D			G
Guinea								A	B	C	D			G
Guinea-Bissau								A						G
Guyana								A			D			G

State	Signature, succession to signature							Ratification, accession or succession						
	A	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*	*F*	*G*	*A*	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*	*F*	*G*
Haiti								A			D			G
Holy See	A			D				A			D			
Honduras								A			D			G
Hungary	A						G	A		C	D		F	G
Iceland							G	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
India								A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Indonesia								A	B		D	E		
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	A	B	C	D				A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Iraq	A	B	C					A	B	C	D	E		G
Ireland	A		C	D		F		A			D			G
Israel	A		C	D				A						G
Italy	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Jamaica								A			D			G
Japan	A		C					A		C	D		F	G
Jordan								A			D			G
Kazakhstan								A			D			G
Kenya								A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Kiribati								A			D			G
Kuwait				D	E	F		A		C	D			G
Kyrgyzstan								A			D			G
Lao People's Democratic Republic								A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Latvia								A			D			G
Lebanon	A	B	C	D		F		A			D			G
Lesotho								A			D			G
Liberia	A			D	E	F		A	B	C	D			G
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya								A	B		D			G
Liechtenstein	A		C	D		F		A		C	D		F	G
Lithuania								A			D			G
Luxembourg	A		C	D		F		A		C	D		F	G
Madagascar								A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Malawi								A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Malaysia								A	B	C	D			G
Maldives								A			D			G
Mali								A			D			G
Malta								A		C	D			G
Marshall Islands								A			D			G
Mauritania								A			D			G
Mauritius								A		C	D		F	G

State	Signature, succession to signature							Ratification, accession or succession						
	A	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*	*F*	*G*	*A*	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*	*F*	*G*
Mexico	A			D				A			D		F	G
Micronesia (Federated States of)								A			D			G
Monaco								A			D			G
Mongolia							G	A			D			G
Montenegro						F	F	A	B	C	D			G
Morocco								A	B		D	E		G
Mozambique								A			D			G
Myanmar								A	B		D			G
Namibia								A			D			
Nauru								A						G
Nepal								A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Netherlands								A	B	C	D	E	F	G
New Zealand	A		C					A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Nicaragua							G	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Niger				D		F		A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Nigeria	A							A			D			
Niue														G
Norway	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Oman								A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Pakistan	A							A		C	D		F	G
Palau														G
Panama	A			D	E	F		A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Papua New Guinea								A			D			G
Paraguay							G	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Peru				D		F		A			D		F	G
Philippines	A	B	C	D		F		A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Poland	A			D			G	A			D			G
Portugal								A			D			G
Qatar								A			D			G
Republic of Korea	A	B	C					A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Republic of Moldova								A			D			G
Romania	A						G	A		C	D		F	G
Russian Federation	A						G	A			D			G
Rwanda							G	A			D			G
Saint Kitts and Nevis														G
Saint Lucia								A			D			
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines								A			D			G

State	Signature, succession to signature							Ratification, accession or succession						
	A	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*	*F*	*G*	*A*	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*	*F*	*G*
Samoa								A			D			
San Marino	A							A						
Sao Tome and Principe								A			D			G
Saudi Arabia								A			D			G
Senegal	A	B						A			D	E	F	G
Serbia					E	F		A	B	C	D			G
Seychelles								A		C	D		F	G
Sierra Leone								A						G
Singapore								A			D			G
Slovakia								A		C	D		F	G
Slovenia								A		C	D			G
Solomon Islands														
Somalia								A			D			
South Africa	A							A			D			G
Spain								A			D			G
Sri Lanka	A							A	B	C	D			G
Sudan								A			D			G
Suriname								A	B	C	D	E	F	
Swaziland								A						G
Sweden	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Switzerland	A		C	D		F		A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Syrian Arab Republic								A			D			G
Tajikistan								A			D			G
Thailand	A	B						A	B		D	E		G
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia								A	B	C	D			G
Timor-Leste								A			D			
Togo								A			D			G
Tonga								A			D			G
Trinidad and Tobago								A			D			G
Tunisia							G	A	B		D	E		G
Turkey								A			D			G
Turkmenistan								A			D			G
Tuvalu								A			D			
Uganda								A						G
Ukraine	A						G	A			D			G
United Arab Emirates								A			D			G
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	A		C	D		F	G	A		C	D		F	G

	Signature, succession to signature							*Ratification, accession or succession*						
State	*A*	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*	*F*	*G*	*A*	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*	*F*	*G*
United Republic of Tanzania	A	B	C					A	B	C	D			
United States of America	A		C	D			G	A		C	D			G
Uruguay	A			D		F		A			D			G
Uzbekistan								A			D			G
Vanuatu											D			
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	A			D				A			D			G
Viet Nam								A			D			G
Yemen								A			D			G
Zambia								A						
Zimbabwe								A			D			

United Nations A/65/113

General Assembly

Distr.: General
1 July 2010

Original: English

Sixty-fifth session
Item 107 of the preliminary list*
Crime prevention and criminal justice

Improving the coordination of efforts against trafficking in persons

Report of the Secretary-General

Summary

Prepared pursuant to General Assembly resolution 64/178, entitled "Improving the coordination of efforts against trafficking in persons", the present report summarizes the work done by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime on the implementation of that resolution and contains proposals on strengthening the capacities of the Office for the efficient implementation of its coordination functions.

* A/65/50.

V.10-54913 (E) 080710 090710

Please recycle

I. Introduction

1. In its resolution 64/178, entitled "Improving the coordination of efforts against trafficking in persons", the General Assembly recognized the importance of bilateral, subregional, regional and international cooperation mechanisms and initiatives, including information exchanges on good practices, of Governments and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to address the problem of trafficking in persons, especially women and children.

2. The General Assembly also recognized that broad international cooperation between Member States and relevant intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations was essential for effectively countering the threat of trafficking in persons and other contemporary forms of slavery.

3. In that respect, the General Assembly encouraged all stakeholders, including the private sector, to strengthen the coordination of efforts, including through the Inter-Agency Coordination Group against Trafficking in Persons and regional and bilateral initiatives that promote cooperation and collaboration.

4. The General Assembly took note with appreciation of the decision of the President of the sixty-third session of the Assembly to appoint the co-facilitators to start consultations and consideration by Member States of a United Nations global plan of action on preventing trafficking in persons, prosecuting traffickers and protecting and assisting victims of trafficking, and stressed the need for the consultations to be held in an open, inclusive and transparent manner, taking into account all the views expressed by Member States.

5. In that same resolution, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to invite, as appropriate, regional organizations to share information on challenges experienced and best practices in coordinating efforts to prevent and combat trafficking in persons, and to submit to the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and to the Assembly at its sixty-fifth session a report on the implementation of that resolution.

II. Inter-Agency Coordination Group against Trafficking in Persons

6. The Inter-Agency Coordination Group in Trafficking in Persons, which was created in Tokyo in September 2006, held two meetings in New York in 2007 and two meetings, organized by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), in Vienna, in April 2009 and in January 2010.

Recommendations of the Inter-Agency Coordination Group

7. With regard to horizontal cooperation, the Inter-Agency Coordination Group agreed to have a rotating Chair and to host meetings in different venues to increase ownership by the participating organizations. The meetings would focus on different aspects of trafficking in persons, depending on the Chair, in order to make the most of the different mandates. UNODC would maintain the role within the Group outlined in General Assembly resolution 61/180, in which the Assembly requested

the Secretary-General to entrust the Executive Director of UNODC with coordinating activities, bearing in mind the availability of extrabudgetary resources.

8. With regard to vertical cooperation, the coordination activities of the Inter-Agency Coordination Group should be carried out not only at the global level but also at the regional and national level (through a phased approach). In addition, the Group is exploring synergies with existing coordination mechanisms at all levels.

9. With regard to its workplan, the Group will continue to meet at least once a year. UNODC will chair the next meeting and facilitate a side event on the Group in parallel with the fifth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, to be held in Vienna in October 2010. In support of the side event, the Group will produce a short background paper providing a description of the mandate, priorities and knowledge gaps relative to each member's particular work on trafficking in persons.

10. Other planned activities include: the dissemination of messages to the field and country offices of the Group's members to explain the role and tasks of the Group; the preparation of terms of reference for the rotating Chair of the Group, outlining the role and duration of the position; and the exchange of information between the Group's focal points on developments related to the global plan of action on trafficking in persons.

11. Member States are invited to carefully consider increasing the level of regular and extrabudgetary resources to allow the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme to fully implement its mandates on combating trafficking in persons, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 64/178.

III. Global plan of action on preventing trafficking in persons, prosecuting traffickers and protecting and assisting victims of trafficking

12. On 19 March 2010, the ambassadors of Cape Verde and Portugal, in their role as co-facilitators, convened a meeting to start consultations and consideration by Member States of a United Nations global plan of action on preventing trafficking in persons. The co-facilitators had drafted, for consideration at the meeting, a document entitled "A global plan of action against trafficking in persons: possible goals and elements". The paper was intended to launch the discussion at the first meeting of the process of consultations. It provided information on efforts made by the General Assembly to combat trafficking in persons and outlined some goals for and possible elements of the global plan of action, which had been included in a background paper prepared for the thematic debate of the Assembly on trafficking in persons held in May 2009.

13. The President of the sixty-fourth session of the General Assembly, the Executive Director of UNODC and others spoke at the meeting, which was very well attended by Member States. The co-facilitators then asked Member States and international organizations to send their contributions and comments on the document, which would be included in a first draft plan of action and circulated to Member States.

14. On 21 April 2010, the co-facilitators convened the second meeting on the global plan of action on trafficking in persons in order to circulate the first draft plan of action, give further explanations regarding its content and invite general preliminary comments on the draft text. These comments were received, the draft was accordingly modified and a third meeting to negotiate the draft text of the global plan of action was convened on 26 May 2010. As a result of that meeting, as of mid-June, proposals had been formulated for all sections of the draft global plan of action and negotiations with Member States were ongoing and expected to come to fruition in the following weeks.

IV. Input from regional organizations on challenges experienced and best practices in coordinating efforts to prevent and combat trafficking in persons

15. UNODC invited over 50 regional organizations to share relevant information and received responses from the Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings of the Council of Europe, the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union (Frontex), the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the International Centre for Migration Policy Development.

A. *Toolkit to Combat Trafficking in Persons*: initiatives worldwide

16. In 2008, UNODC published the second edition of its *Toolkit to Combat Trafficking in Persons*.[1] In the Toolkit, UNODC presented examples of promising practice from around the world relating to trafficking interventions in order to demonstrate the range of resources available to those involved in efforts against trafficking. The Toolkit contains many examples from regional organizations of challenges experienced and best practices in coordinating efforts to prevent and combat trafficking in persons.

17. For instance, in October 2004, the memorandum of understanding on cooperation against trafficking in persons in the Greater Mekong Subregion was signed by the Coordinated Mekong Ministerial Initiative against Trafficking. After a year of negotiations, ministerial representatives of Cambodia, China, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Thailand and Viet Nam signed the comprehensive memorandum of understanding and committed themselves to taking joint action to combat all aspects of trafficking in persons. It is the first of its kind in the Asia and Pacific region and it clearly lays out methods and areas of policy and cooperation at both the national and international levels with regard to the legal framework, law enforcement, criminal justice, protection, the recovery and reintegration of victims and preventive measures.

18. In the areas of the legal framework, law enforcement and justice, the six States have committed themselves to do the following:

[1] United Nations publication, Sales No. E.08.V.14.

(a) To quickly adopt and enforce appropriate legislation against trafficking in persons;

(b) To provide training to officials to permit the rapid and accurate identification of trafficked persons;

(c) To develop efficient cooperation in the criminal justice system;

(d) To strengthen cross-border cooperation in law enforcement among the six States to combat trafficking through the criminal justice process;

(e) To provide the necessary personnel and budgetary support for trafficking response capacities within national law enforcement authorities;

(f) To promote bilateral or multilateral agreements among the participating States to assist each other in the judicial process.

19. In addition, chiefs of police from each of the States members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) take part in regular conferences and have agreed to work together to combat trafficking in persons. At the 25th Annual Conference of ASEAN Chiefs of Police, held in Bali, Indonesia, from 16 to 20 May 2005, participants identified the following objectives: to further enhance police professionalism, to forge stronger regional cooperation in police work and to promote lasting friendships among police officers of ASEAN countries. The conference, attended by delegates from Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Viet Nam, adopted the following resolutions with respect to trafficking in persons:

(a) To enhance information exchange among member States on the identities, movements and activities of transnational criminal organizations involved in trafficking in persons;

(b) To appoint, update and disseminate the contact points of each member country for the purpose of liaison and exchange of information on trafficking in persons;

(c) To encourage member States to conclude bilateral or multilateral agreements on combating trafficking in persons and enhance cooperation on border control management.

20. The Eurojust initiative is an example of a way of supporting existing regional structures. The European Union has established a liaison network of prosecutors (Eurojust) in order to deal more efficiently with cross-border crime, in particular crime committed by organized transnational criminal groups. Each member State nominates one prosecutor to join Eurojust, which is based in The Hague and is involved in the following:

(a) Stimulating and improving the coordination of investigations and prosecutions between competent authorities in European Union member States;

(b) Taking into account any request emanating from a competent authority of a member State and any information provided by any body competent by virtue of provisions adopted within the framework of the treaties;

(c) Improving cooperation between the competent authorities of the member States, in particular by facilitating the execution of international mutual legal assistance and the implementation of extradition requests;

(d) Supporting the competent authorities of the member States in order to render their investigations and prosecutions more effective when dealing with cross-border crime.

21. By achieving those objectives, Eurojust enhances cooperation and coordination between national investigating and prosecuting authorities, allowing all law enforcement agencies to act more effectively, both individually and collectively, when dealing with international crime and more importantly to bring criminals to justice more quickly.

22. Another example of a regional best practice in coordinating efforts to prevent and combat trafficking in persons is the Task Force on Organized Crime in the Baltic Sea Region. Pursuant to its vision statement, adopted by the third Heads of Government Meeting in May 2006, the Task Force "acts as a regional best practice example in Europe for multidisciplinary operational law enforcement cooperation against organized crime". Following a meeting of the Operative Committee of the Task Force in November 2003, the Expert Group on Illegal Migration and the Expert Group on Trafficking in Women were merged to form the Expert Group on Trafficking in Persons, consisting of experts from law enforcement authorities of member States, as well as the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) and the European Police Office (Europol). The primary task of the Expert Group is to assess the situation with regard to trafficking in persons in the Baltic Sea region and to coordinate and present national and international operations in response to it. The experts meet regularly to discuss implementation of Task Force decisions. The Expert Group has also developed close contacts with the Network of Prosecutors General in the Baltic Sea States, Eurojust and the Task Force against Trafficking in Human Beings in the Barents Euro-Arctic region.

23. The Regional Victim/Witness Protection Protocol to Combat Trafficking, Commercial Exploitation and Sexual Abuse of Women and Children in South Asia is an attempt by the Regional Action Forum on Improving the Implementation of Laws Protecting Women and Children to establish norms for the protection of victim-witnesses in Bangladesh, India, Nepal and Sri Lanka. Although the laws (penal codes, criminal procedure codes and constitutions) of those countries refer to witness protection, the drafters of the Protocol believe that the existing laws are insufficient to adequately protect women and child victim-witnesses who have been trafficked for sexual exploitation. In response, the Protocol is rights-based and regionally specific to protect and promote the rights of victims and witnesses of crimes in proceedings where their lives, psychological and physical security and property are endangered through their participation in the criminal justice system. The Protocol is a response to the need for a common approach and for common principles to guide the protection of victims and witnesses.

B. Council of Europe

24. The Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings[2] is the first European treaty in this field and is considered to be one of the Council of Europe's major achievements in its 60 years of existence.

25. The Council of Europe Convention has a monitoring mechanism consisting of two pillars: the Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings, a technical body composed of independent and highly qualified experts, and the Committee of the Parties, a political body composed of representatives of the parties to the Convention in the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, as well as representatives of parties that are not members of the Council of Europe. The Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings will evaluate the implementation of the Convention by the parties following a procedure divided into rounds. The first round of evaluations was launched in 2010 and will finish at the end of 2013.

26. The Council of Europe Convention highlights the importance of partnerships among States, international organizations, civil society and national entities. Chapter IV of the Council of Europe Convention is devoted to international cooperation and cooperation with civil society. Trafficking in persons is by definition a transversal issue and therefore concerns most national policies and actors. Consequently, any national action to combat trafficking in persons must be global and multisectoral, and take on board the required multidisciplinary expertise. To be effective, this comprehensive national action must be coordinated through a specific governmental body or entity, as set out in article 29 of the Council of Europe Convention.

27. A relevant example of coordinated action is the Council of Europe's campaign to combat trafficking in human beings, carried out between 2006 and 2008 under the slogan "Human beings — not for sale". The main aims of the campaign were to raise awareness of the problem of trafficking in persons and to identify possible solutions and promote the widest possible signature and ratification of the Council of Europe Convention. A total of 41 member States participated in one or more of the 11 information and awareness-raising seminars aimed at highlighting measures that can be taken to prevent this form of slavery, to protect the human rights of victims and to prosecute traffickers and their accomplices. The campaign was one of the most successful campaigns of the Council of Europe, not only in terms of raising awareness, but also because it led to the prompt ratification of the Council of Europe Convention by many States, which in turn resulted in the Convention's rapid entry into force.

28. In addition, the Council of Europe has given its support to the Pan-European Campaign on Compensation for Trafficked Persons, to be launched in July 2010 by Anti-Slavery International and La Strada International, together with partners in 13 countries. The Campaign is based on the provisions of article 15 of the Council of Europe Convention, on compensation and legal redress to victims of trafficking in persons.

---

[2] Council of Europe, *Treaty Series*, No. 197.

29. Another example of good practice in coordinating different international organizations working against trafficking in persons is the joint Council of Europe/United Nations study, *Trafficking in Organs, Tissues and Cells and Trafficking in Human Beings for the Purpose of the Removal of Organs*. The Council of Europe and the United Nations prepared this joint study pursuant to General Assembly resolution 63/14, entitled "Cooperation between the United Nations and the Council of Europe", which was adopted in 2008. One of the outcomes of the joint study is the recommendation that an international legal instrument be prepared, setting out a definition of "trafficking in organs, tissues and cells" and the measures to prevent such trafficking and protect the victims, as well as the criminal law measures to punish the crime.

C. Frontex

30. Frontex, a European Union agency based in Warsaw, was created as a specialized and independent body tasked with coordinating operations between member States in the field of border security. The activities of Frontex are intelligence-driven. Frontex complements and adds specialized value to the national border management systems of member States.

31. Frontex has experienced many challenges and identified best practices in coordinating efforts to prevent and combat trafficking in persons. It recognizes that a large variety of new initiatives and best practices covering all facets of trafficking in persons exists at the national level in member States, but that quite often information on such initiatives and best practices is not exchanged. Some of that information would also be useful to border control authorities in their fight against trafficking in persons. A centralized structure and the sharing of detailed documentation of identified good practices and successful new initiatives across European Union member States would be helpful, as would the mutual provision of help to implement the initiatives.

32. Not all European Union member States have ratified the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime[3] or signed the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings. Legislation on trafficking in persons differs in European Union member States and, in practice, there are no uniform procedures for dealing with such trafficking. The differences in procedures reduce the effectiveness of member States working together and could pose risks during joint operations carried out in the framework of Frontex.

33. In terms of collecting information on various aspects of trafficking in persons, a main challenge is the dispersal of national databases and data collection measures among different authorities. As a result, the picture remains very fragmented and some opportunities for preventing and fighting the phenomenon are not made use of.

34. In the experience of the member States of Frontex, profiling and identifying suspects and victims is very important. Some member States have formed teams to

[3] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2237, No. 39574.

do profiling at airports, or charged operative and analytical units with preparing lists, for use at border-crossing points, of profiled victims and facilitators of trafficking in persons. If there are indications at a border control post that trafficking in persons is taking place, a thorough profiling is carried out to verify whether the offence is taking place or not. In addition, border control officers profile passengers during immigration procedures. This profiling includes victims and suspects. Specific profiles may be sent out to frontline officers, especially if a new trend has been identified.

35. Most European Union member States intensify their collaborative efforts with international organizations such as Europol against illegal migration by setting up joint data files, exchanging and evaluating data and, in particular, establishing modi operandi between various member States so as to facilitate the flow of information. In addition, international joint investigation groups are being set up. Special multi-agency organizations acting as central coordinators of intelligence, analysis and operations aimed at combating trafficking in persons have been established and work very closely with law enforcement agencies throughout the country, but also internationally. Sometimes, these organizations work together with non-governmental organizations to help combat trafficking in persons and related crimes.

D. International Centre for Migration Policy Development

36. The International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD) was founded in 1993, upon the initiative of Austria and Switzerland, to serve as a support mechanism for informal consultations and to provide expertise and efficient services in the newly emerging landscape of multilateral cooperation on migration and asylum issues. Through its recently published *Study on Post-trafficking Experiences* in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Italy and Portugal, ICMPD outlines how the current transnational referral framework in the countries mentioned in the title is understood, perceived and experienced by trafficked persons. In addition, it considers, from the perspective of those working to fight trafficking in persons, the following issues: identification; first assistance and protection; longer-term assistance and social inclusion; criminal and civil proceedings; and return and social inclusion.

37. The findings of the study, which are based on interviews with trafficked persons and those working to fight trafficking in persons, can serve to guide service providers in their daily work with trafficked persons and policymakers designing national and transnational referral mechanisms and anti-trafficking strategies and action plans.

38. The study found that, overall, identification procedures needed to be strengthened further, since they continue to constitute a weakness in the referral process. Information on assistance and protection programmes needs to be more visible and more easily available. Most trafficked persons were uninformed and unaware of how to get out of exploitative situations and of how to get assistance. In addition, cultural mediators should be utilized to facilitate communication between trafficked persons and service providers and the authorities. The presence of a cultural mediator is very helpful and contributes to the well-being of trafficked

persons. Appropriate communication with trafficked persons is crucial at all stages of an anti-human trafficking intervention. Cultural mediators are not only able to interpret between speakers of different languages, but also understand the customs, values and habits of the culture of trafficked persons and the service providers and authorities in the destination country.

39. In order to meet the basic needs of trafficked persons, it is crucial to provide appropriate and adequate first assistance and protection, which often comes in the form of shelter. In addition, longer-term assistance and social inclusion efforts need to be properly planned. Providers of such assistance should try to help and protect trafficked persons while promoting their autonomy and self-confidence. It is important to remember that providing protection to trafficked persons also means promoting their abilities and skills.

40. In order to be able to adequately identify, assist and protect trafficked persons, those working to fight trafficking in persons must cooperate and communicate well, not only within a country, but also between countries of origin, transit and destination. All relevant governmental, non-governmental and international actors have to be properly connected. Only if transnational referral mechanisms function well can return procedures be carried out in an appropriate way and can trafficked persons be adequately assisted and protected, both upon and after arrival in the country of origin or in a third country. Since most cases of trafficking in persons have transnational elements, cooperation between embassies in countries of origin, transit and destination needs to be improved.

E. Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe

41. In 2004, on the basis of the OSCE Platform for Cooperative Security, and taking into account the Edinburgh Declaration of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, in which the Assembly encouraged OSCE to take a leading role in the OSCE region in coordinating, at the level of headquarters and in the field, all regional efforts to combat human trafficking, in cooperation with the United Nations and other international organizations, OSCE initiated the establishment of the Alliance against Trafficking in Persons.

42. The Alliance was designed to serve the following goals, beneficial for both the Alliance's partners and OSCE participating States: to exchange best practices and information, to share experience, to explore new approaches to better tackle trafficking in persons, to establish shared priorities and to undertake common initiatives, thus ensuring better coordination among international organizations and diminishing duplication. In addition, the Alliance was expected to provide OSCE participating States and partners with harmonized, evidence-based approaches and international expertise, and to serve as a platform for dialogue with civil society.

43. The Alliance has been functioning through two complementary formats: (a) high-level conferences conducted once or twice a year and hosted by the special representative charged with drawing attention to the most pressing aspects of human trafficking, and (b) the Alliance Expert Coordination Team, which brings together representatives of leading international organizations and non-governmental organizations and provides an operational and consultative forum for strategic networking and joint actions in the OSCE area. The Alliance Expert Coordination

Team also includes representatives from OSCE structures and institutions such as the Office of the Special Representative and Coordinator for Combating Trafficking in Human Beings, the Strategic Police Matters Unit, the Office of the Coordinator of Economic and Environmental Activities, the office of the Senior Adviser on Gender Issues and the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. The Team holds meetings twice a year, hosted by the Special Representative, to update partners on activities carried out to combat trafficking in persons, share plans for the future, discuss problematic issues, identify priorities, and develop joint initiatives.

44. Between 2004 and 2010, the Special Representative organized and hosted the Alliance's high-level conferences and seminars, which were dedicated to topics that had been recognized as priority issues by those working against trafficking in persons. Recent initiatives include a conference on unprotected work, invisible exploitation: trafficking for the purpose of domestic servitude (Vienna, 17-18 June 2010); a technical seminar on trafficking for labour exploitation, focusing on the agricultural sector (Vienna, 27-28 April 2010); and a conference on the prevention of modern slavery (Vienna, 14-15 September 2009).

45. Alliance events are usually attended by hundreds of representatives from the 56 OSCE participating States, including practitioners from those States' capitals, and representatives of non-governmental organizations, prominent experts, academics, parliamentarians and media representatives. These events provide an optimal platform for awareness-raising, exchanging best practices, networking, capacity-building and elaborating on recommendations. Importantly, they also ensure geographical balance. The outcomes of many of these events have been taken into account and have provided the basis for the preparation of OSCE Ministerial Council decisions.

46. Alliance events have led to the publication of papers, as part of the OSCE Occasional Papers Series, on trafficking in persons for labour exploitation (including on trafficking in persons for exploitation in the agricultural sector) and of position papers setting out the agreed opinion of Alliance partners on victim protection tailored to the needs of children and on the protection of trafficked persons. The Special Representative plans to publish, in 2010, a paper on domestic servitude as part of the Occasional Paper Series.

V. Conclusion

47. In its resolution 64/178, the General Assembly reiterated its request to the Secretary-General to provide the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme with sufficient resources for the full implementation of its mandates on combating trafficking in persons, in conformity with its high priorities, and to provide adequate support to the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, and invited Member States to provide voluntary contributions to UNODC for the purpose of providing assistance to Member States upon request.

48. UNODC expresses its gratitude to donors for the voluntary contributions made available for strengthening its capacities in its coordinating functions and invites Member States to strongly consider increasing the level of regular budget resources to allow UNODC to implement its mandates on combating trafficking in persons.